

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 2-5, 7-13, 15, and 17-20 remain pending. In this Reply, Applicant has amended independent claims 17 and 19.

**Telephone Interview**

Initially, Applicant appreciates the opportunity granted by the Examiner to conduct a telephone interview with Applicant and his representative on September 10, 2003. During the course of the interview, Applicant discussed the claimed invention and significant differences between the claims and the applied prior art. The Examiner expressed her view that the claims are unclear/indefinite and suggested that the claims be further amended to clarify the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention and how the invention distinguishes from the applied prior art. In this Reply, Applicant has amended independent claim 17 (directed to an apparatus) and independent claim 19 (directed to a method). Applicant believes that these amendments are entirely consistent with the suggestions made by the Examiner during the course of the telephone interview and respectfully requests favorable consideration of the claims as now pending.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 17-20, 2-5, 7-13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In this Reply, Applicant has amended independent claims 17 and 19 in a manner which is believed to be consistent with the Examiner's suggestions for clarifying the scope of Applicant's invention. In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be reconsidered and withdrawn. With regard to certain terms questioned by the Examiner on pages 3-4 of the Office Action, Applicant believes that these terms are clear and definite, particularly in light of the specification and the claim amendments presented herein.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

**Prior Art Rejection**

Claims 2-5, 7-13, 15, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over *Street* (WO 97/22033) in view of *Young* (U.S. Patent 5,689,340). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the telephone interview of September 10, 2003, it is Applicant's view that the asserted prior art, taken alone or in combination (assuming these references may be combined, which Applicant does not admit), fails to support a finding of *prima facie* obviousness. As per the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant has amended independent claims 17 and 19 to clarify the distinctions of the claimed invention over the applied prior art. In view of these amendments and the distinctions over the prior art discussed during the telephone interview and the Reply dated January 17, 2003 (such remarks being incorporated herein in their entirety for the sake of conciseness), Applicant respectfully requests that the prior art rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **Objection to Drawings/Specification**

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objection to the drawings based on the conclusion that the previous drawing corrections/specification amendments introduced new matter.

Fig. 3 does not constitute new matter. Instead, Fig. 3 is merely an isometric view, which incorporates a number of elements arranged with respect to each other in a manner clearly evident from the original text and Figs. 1 and 2. The light source 13 positioned behind a barrier screen 2 is clearly described at p. 6,

lines 31-32 of the original disclosure, and is also illustrated in the sectional view of Fig. 1. The positioning of patterns 20 and 21 is described at original p. 6, line 33 - p. 7, line 2. More specifically, these patterns are described as typically being separated by a considerable gap, with one pattern on the left hand side of the barrier screen and the other on the right hand side, as now illustrated in Fig. 3. The lenticular screen 1 is positioned in front of the barrier screen 2, as shown in the sectional view of Fig. 1 and described for example at original specification, p. 5, lines 2-3. In Fig. 1, the lenticular screen is shown to have a series of convergent elements, one of which is numbered element 4. See also p. 5, lines 9-11. In Fig. 3, two such elements are shown as elements 25 and 26, consistent with the original description and illustration of the disclosed embodiment. For clarity, lens 6 of original Fig. 1 and a counterpart for the second arrangement on the left hand side of the lenticular screen 1 are shown cut away for ease of illustration of apertures 22, 23, which are also shown in Fig. 2. The isometric view of Fig. 3 illustrates vertical motion 24 and horizontal motion 12 of the lenticular screen 1 relative to the barrier screen 2, as clearly described in the original specification, for example at p. 7, lines 9-30. Thus, the text as originally filed disclosed the arrangement as now illustrated in new Fig. 3, particularly in light of known arrangements on which

the present invention improves. For sake of clarity and ease of description, minor amendments have been made to the specification to include reference numerals for elements illustrated in Fig. 3, which are described in the original specification. Accordingly, these amendments to the specification likewise do not raise the issue of new matter.

In view of the above remarks and new Fig. 3, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the drawings. Also, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider her conclusion that the specification amendments/new drawing introduce new matter.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Applicant respectfully petitions for a three (3) month extension of time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a). A check in the amount of \$465.00 in payment of the extension of time fee is attached.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

Appl. No. 09/869,859

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

D. Richard Anderson, #40,439

DRA/jdm  
0787-0117P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000